



3624
2/2/05

Attorney Docket No.: 612/2

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:
Webster Hughes

Application No.: 09/706,678

Group Art Unit: 3624

Filed: November 6, 2000

Examiner: Patel, Jagdish

For: METHOD & SYSTEM FOR REBROKERING
ORDERS ...

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
M.S. Amendment
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

AMENDMENT PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §1.111

Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed November 16, 2004, please reconsider the
above-identified patent application amended as follows and in light of the following remarks:

02/22/2005 PLEWIS 00000004 110223 09706678

01 FC:1202 1300.00 DA
02 FC:1201 200.00 DA

OK fee paid

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS: Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date shown below.

Dated: January 4, 2005

Signature: *Ute H. Wojtkowski*

Print Name: Ute H. Wojtkowski

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 18-25, 29-33, and 46 that are pending in the above-identified patent application. Claims 1-17, 26-28, and 34-45 have been withdrawn from consideration. Applicant has amended claims 18-25 and 29-33 and added new claim 46. No new matter has been added by the claim amendments.

At pages 2-5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 18-25 and 29-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. In response, Applicant amended claims 18-25 and 29-33 and added new claim 46 to more clearly recite various embodiments of the present invention. It is submitted that these claim amendments neither add new matter nor narrow the claims. If the Examiner disagrees with this, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner state his reasons for disagreement. More particularly, the Applicant submits that the body of claim 18 refers to the various parties to the transaction in a way that clearly identifies the claimed subject matter. As to claims 19 and 20, Applicant submits that there are no essential steps missing and that antecedent basis is provided for each claim limitation. As to claim 21 and 22, Applicant submits that the meaning of "a live, executable order" or "a subject order" is clear given the description of various aspects of the invention at page 16, lines 7-19. As to claim 23, Applicant submits that there is antecedent basis as to the communication of live, executable orders.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that the instant claims are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is earnestly solicited. In the event there are any fees due and owing in connection with this matter, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 11-0223.

Dated: January 4, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Matthew B. Dernier

Registration No.: 40,989

KAPLAN & GILMAN, L.L.P.

900 Route 9 North, Suite 104

Woodbridge, New Jersey 07095

(732) 634-7634

Attorneys for Applicant